

REMARKS

In the January 21, 2005 Office Action, claims 1-3, 9-13 and 19-20 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 4-8 and 14-18 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter. No other objections or rejections are made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the January 21, 2005 Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-5, 9-11, 14, and 19-20 as indicated above. Claims 2-3 and 12-13 have been canceled. Claim 14 has been amended in an independent form. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1, 4-11, and 14-20 are pending, with claims 1, 11, and 14 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 9, 11-13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,173,317 to Hamayasu et al. ("Hamayasu patent"), and claims 10 and 20 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,116,531 to Young ("Young patent"). In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the first sound producing portion is coupled to the spool shaft so as to be ***unrotatable*** relative to the spool shaft and rotatable relative to the second sound producing portion when the spool rotates in a ***line releasing direction***, and ***rotatable*** relative to the spool shaft and unrotatable relative to the second sound producing portion when the spool rotates in a ***line winding direction***. These limitations are supported by paragraph [0048] of the specification as originally filed. Clearly, this structure is ***not*** disclosed or suggested by the Hamayasu patent, the Young patent, or any other prior art of record.

Regarding the Hamayasu patent, the Office Action asserts that the disc 11 corresponds to the first sound producing portion of claims 1 and 11 of the present application, while the sounder 12 corresponds to the second sound producing portion. As clearly indicated in column 3, lines 34-37 of the Hamayasu patent, the disc 11 is stationary with respect to the spool shaft 5. It is the sounder 12 that becomes rotatable and unrotatable with respect to the spool 6 by contracting and releaseing its engagement with the spool 6 when the

spool is rotated in the direction of arrow A shown in Figure 2. *See* column 4, lines 38-46. On the other hand, claims 1 and 11 as currently amended require the *first sound producing portion to become rotatable and unrotatable relative to the spool shaft* depending on the direction of the spool rotation, *not* the second sound producing portion that is mounted to the spool. Thus, the arrangement of the Hamayasu patent is clearly contrary to the requirements of claims 1 and 11 as currently amended. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 11 as now amended are not anticipated by the Hamayasu patent.

Regarding the Young patent, it appears that the Young patent is cited in the Office Action only to show the use of a pawl member and a spring member that urges the front end of the pawl member toward the saw tooth portions. Clearly, the Young patent does not disclose or suggest a first sound producing portion that becomes rotatable and unrotatable relative to the spool shaft depending on the direction of the spool rotation. Thus, the Young patent does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claims 1 and 11, whether taken singularly or in combination with the Hamayasu patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 11 as now amended are not anticipated by the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 2-3, 9-10, 12-13 and 19-20, claims 2-3 and 12-13 have been canceled. Thus, rejections to claims 2-3 and 12-13 are now moot. Claims 9-10 and 19-20 depend from claims 1 and 11, and are therefore narrower. Since claims 1 and 11 are believed to be allowable in view of the amendment presented above, Applicant believes that claims 9-10 and 19-20 are also allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 4-8 and 14-18 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicant has amended claim 14 to in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, independent claim 14, as well as its dependent claims 15-18, is believed to be allowable.

Claim 4 has been amended as presented above and remains dependent from claim 1. Since Applicants believe that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, Applicant also believes that claims 4-8 are allowable.


Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references are made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 4-11, and 14-20 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Kiyoe K. Kabashima
Reg. No. 54,874

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: Apr 20 2005

G:\04-APR05-MTSN-US020834 Amendment.doc